UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,357	07/17/2006	Suguru Fukui	80097(302721)	3094
	7590 07/06/200 NGELL PALMER & D	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 5587		HSIEH, PING Y		
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/586,357	FUKUI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PING Y. HSIEH	2618	

	PING Y. HSIEH	2618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavieal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u> 3.	out prior to the data of filing a brick	will make a sectional ba	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);	
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
<ul><li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li><li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-7</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a ).
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Lana N. Le/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2614	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In pages 7-10 of the remarks, regarding claim 1, applicant argues that Taniguchi fails to disclose a regulator in the transmitter which is connected to the power supply and provides an operating voltage for a short time perios only upon receiving a detection output (Dout) from the detection circuit. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees and wants to point out that Taniguchi in col. 3, lines 45-65, col. 7 lines 4-12, col. 8 lines 43-49 and fig. 2-4 discloses a switch SW1 is set between the power source unit 6 and the local oscillator 14, a switch SW3 is set between the power source unit 6 and the frequency converter 151, a switch SW5 is set between the power source unit 5 and supplies the switch-ON signals for controlling the switches SW1, SW3, SW5 within a predetermined time, that is, supplying the power source to the local oscillator 14, the frequency converter 151, the transmitting power amplifier 152 (read on the limitation of a regulator that is included in the radio transmitter, connected to receive said electric power from said power supply and configured to give an operating voltage for a short time period only upon receiving said detection output from said detection circuit in claim 1). Therefore, based on the logical response to the arguments provided above, the examiner respectfully renders claims 1, 3-7 unpatentable over the cited art. Applicant presents additional arguments which do not render the claims allowable after the prosecution on the merit is closed.